SALVATION ARMY DIVISION CAMP AND RETREAT CENTER

APPENDIX D3

Results of the Sierra Del Mar Salvation Army Survey

Prepared by ASM Affiliates, Inc.

February 18, 1999

A · S · M

a f f i l i a t e s

February 18, 1999

Mr. Erich R. Lathers
BRG Consulting, Inc.
1550 Hotel Circle Drive North, Suite 320
San Diego, California 92108-2909

RE: Results of the Sierra Del Mar Salvation Army Survey

Dear Mr. Lathers,

This letter outlines the results of an archaeological survey conducted by ASM Affiliates on the Sierra Del Mar Salvation Army Divisional Camp on February 8, 1999. A previous constraints level reconnaissance of the property in December of 1998 by ASM Affiliates identified one previously unrecorded archaeological resource. An additional four archaeological sites were located and recorded as part of this study. None of these sites appear significant, however no significance testing was conducted during this study.

Project Description

The Sierra Del Mar Divisional Camp lies within the eastern 2/3 of Section 1, portions of the northern ½ of Section 12, and a portion of Section 6 within Township 16 South, Range 1 West (Figures 1 and 2). As illustrated on the San Vicente Reservoir 7.5' series USGS quadrangle the camp occupies an open valley to the west of West Branch Creek just north of Wildwood Ranch (Figure 2). The camp is accessed of Mussey Grade Road from a turnout approximately one mile north of Shady Dell.

The topography of the project area is dominated by steep, rocky uplands to the west with elevations ranging up to 2200 feet. These rugged slopes are covered by dense stands of upland sage scrub, and are punctuated by numerous large granitic outcrops. Erosion has sculpted these slopes into broken ridgelines extending down towards an open cismontane valley. Although formally carpeted with bunch grasses and native annuals, this pasture is now dominated by introduced forage grasses. Along the margins and steeper streambanks manicured stands of Live oaks give way to the denser understories of the native riparian communities. Typically harboring large stands of Poison Oak, these thickets are also favored habit for many species of wildlife. Where they have been left unmolested these drainages also preserve the oldest of the local Oak stands and, not infrequently, evidence of prehistoric acorn processing by local residents.

543 Encinitas Blvd., Ste. 114, Encinitas, CA 92024
Voice: [760] 632-1094 · FAX: [760] 632-0913

Cultural Background

Archaeological and ethnographic information indicate that this area of San Diego County has been occupied by Native Americans for nearly 10,000 years. Malcolm Rogers was one of the first local archaeologists to synthesize his data into general culture history and chronological frameworks (Rogers 1945). Unfortunately, Rogers revised his ideas several times, creating much confusion, and he died before presenting a clear and substantive chronology for the region. Numerous regional chronologies and some larger syntheses have been formulated since; these will not be reviewed here (see Moratto 1984).

The prehistory of San Diego County is often divided into three general temporal periods: Paleoindian, Archaic, and Late Prehistoric. The Paleoindian period, dating from 12,000 years to 8,000 years before the present (B.P.), is typified by artifact assemblages of the San Dieguito complex. This complex is represented almost entirely by flaked stone tools, including scrapers, choppers, and large projectile points. The absence of a milling technology was, until recently, seen as the major difference between the Paleoindian period and the later Archaic period. The Archaic period existed at least 7,000 years ago, and probably as early as 9,000 years B.P.

Coastal Archaic period sites have been characterized by the presence of dart points and abundant milling equipment, and an associated lack of ceramics. They range from large residential bases to small temporary camps and resource exploitation loci. Burials dating to this period tend to be flexed inhumations which can be grouped in cemeteries at the larger occupation sites (Cheever 1992). Mortuary remains include shell beads and ornaments, projectile points, and milling equipment.

Wallace (1955:226) suggested a date of about A.D. 1000 for the late prehistoric Shoshonean and Yuman cultures; this date is still accepted for the inception of ceramic technology and small arrow points in the area. Rogers (1945) suggested a tripartite division of the Late Prehistoric period: Yuman I (A.D. 900-1050), Yuman II (A.D. 1050-1500), and Yuman III (post A.D. 1500). Cottonwood Triangular and Desert Side-notched arrow points, and ceramics are diagnostic of the Late Prehistoric period in southern California. Bone tools and various ornaments are also typical (Wallace 1955:215).

Mortuary customs became more elaborate during the Late Prehistoric period, including more abundant grave goods, and cremation apparently diffused into the area from east to west as did ceramics (Wallace 1955:223). Mortuary goods often included metates, pipes, arrow shaft straighteners, shell beads, and arrow points (Treganza 1942:160).

Major ethnographies for this area were researched and written in the 1920s and 1930s (Spier 1923; Gifford 1931), about 150 years after the establishment of the mission system. These include both the Kumeyaay, the Kamia, and groups living in Baja California (Meigs 1939). In general, the

Kumeyaay ranged from the coast through the Peninsular Ranges and the Kamia resided in Imperial Valley in historic times.

Jim McCarty was the sole informant for Spier's (1923) ethnography of the Southern Diegueño and he also served as informant for E. H. Davis (1919) and Gifford (1918). McCarty, from the Campo area, was over eighty years of age in 1923. Gifford's (1931) six informants, all from the Campo and Mesa Grande areas, ranged in age from about 50 to 100 years. Information from biographical sketches of Delfino Cuero and Tom Lucas (Carrico 1983; Cline 1984; Shipek 1991) is also included here. Delfino Cuero is the only ethnographic source on the Kumeyaay occupation of the coastal area, including the La Jolla and Torrey Pines habitats.

Kumeyaay social organization appears to have been loosely structured at the band level. Patrilineal, minimally territorial, exogamous lineages called "*cimuL*," or gentes, have been described as the highest level of Southern Diegueño social organization (Spier 1923). Luomala (1963:285-286, 1978) suggested that residence was not strictly patrilocal, but bilocal, in that newly married Diegueño couples resided with the woman's family as often as not. This type of flexibility may be a cultural response to environmental stresses such as drought (Shipek 1981:297), or a result of reduced population and territory after historic contact.

The Kumeyaay are depicted primarily as hunters and gatherers in ethnographic and ethnohistoric documents, but some groups practiced agriculture in areas of the Imperial Valley and, near Jacumba, others irrigated fields from springs (Gifford 1931:21-22). Shipek (1989) has hypothesized that horticultural practices among the Kumeyaay were widespread and intensive, involving transplantation and cultivation of several native plant species. There is still some controversy regarding the degree of dependence these groups placed on "cultivated" crops versus "natural" crops. Review of the ethnographic and ethnohistoric record indicates that most groups moved to different areas on a seasonal basis to capitalize on particular crops such as acorns or agave, and were not wholly dependent on any one resource. Burning was used by some California Indian groups as a method of environmental manipulation to promote the growth of grasses and flowering annuals, which in turn promoted increases in game populations (Lewis 1973:29; Bean and Lawton 1973:xxi).

Animal resources for the Kumeyaay consisted mostly of small game such as rabbits (*Sylvilagus* spp.), hares (*Lepus californicus*), woodrats (*Neotoma* spp.), lizards, some snakes, and grasshoppers (Spier 1923:335-336; Gifford 1931:14; Shipek 1991:32). Many birds probably were not eaten by the Southern Diegueño (Drucker 1937:8), although this restriction seems to apply mostly to shorebirds. Eagles and buzzards were avoided by the Diegueño; hawks, owls, doves, crows, road runners, and mockingbirds were sometimes avoided and sometimes not (Drucker 1937:8, 1941:100). Larger game, mostly mule deer (*Odocoileus hemionus*) and possibly pronghorn (*Antilocapra americana*, now locally extinct) were also hunted. Boats were used by coastal groups to fish and molluscs were heavily exploited in Mission and San Diego Bays, as well

as the bean clam from open sandy shoreline habitats. The Torrey Pine was also a source of seasonal nuts.

Objectives and Limitations of the Study

As noted in the introduction, a portion of the project area had been previously surveyed by ASM Affiliates some months prior to this investigation. The purpose of the earlier study was to provide a preliminary look into the overall site density potential within the project area. Given the economic patterns of the Kumeyaay and their seasonal land use (see above), valleys such as the one occupied by the Sierra Del Mar Divisional Camp are potentially locations for large habitation sites. Obviously early knowledge of the presence of such resources is of great importance in considering the potential development of a parcel. For this reason constraints level surveys such as the one conducted in December can be useful in forecasting potential problems with a location before a project is undertaken. In this case approximately 35% of the area of highest archaeological potential was covered by the previous constraints level survey. This resulted in the location of one archaeological site, designated here as SDM1(Figure 2). These results suggested that the portion of this valley circumscribed by the Sierra Del Mar Divisional camp did not contain any substantial archaeological resources.

This study constituted a more careful inspection of the accessible portions of the Sierra Del Mar Camp in order to corroborate these findings and to insure that no resources were overlooked within the project boundaries. In addition to the valley floor, all of the lower slopes and drainages were examined during this survey. Only those areas deemed too steep, or too densely covered by Poison Oak, were excluded. Because the majority of the project parcel is made up of very mountainous terrain, the survey was essentially confined to the eastern ½ of the camp.

Study Methods

Prior to the field survey a records search was obtained from the South Coastal Information Center and the San Diego Museum of Man. The field survey was conducted by ASM staff archaeologists Barb Giacomini, Ken Victorino, and Jim Eighmey using 20 meter spacing intervals between linear, parallel transects. Ground visibility within the valley bottom was generally good, ranging from 10% to 60% of the surface area. Visibility along the valley margins was more variable due to vegetation, but acceptable in most locations. Within portions of the northeast 1/4 of the camp dense stands of sage scrub precluded the use of linear transects, necessitating a more opportunistic approach to surveying. It is thought, however, that these areas have very low site potential due to their generally rugged topography.

Throughout the survey considerable care was used to insure that all of the area of highest site potential was thoroughly examined. These areas included the lower riparian zones, the valley margins, and the valley floor. It should be noted that a substantial portion of the lower valley has

been historically impacted through the raising of various structures, road building, and the general land clearing activities associated with ranching. It is uncertain to what degree these activities have impacted either the existing land forms and any archaeological sites within the parcel. No evidence of direct impacts were noted during the survey.

All resources encountered during the survey were flagged, photographed, and mapped. In addition to placement on a standard 7.7' USGS quadrangle, the locations of each site were recorded using a hand-held GPS unit. The standard encrypted error of these units can range up to 100 meters, but are typically less than 25 meters.

Survey Results

A total of four (4) archaeological sites were recorded during this survey in addition to the single site located during the constraints study. These sites were all located in the eastern ½ of the project area (Figure 2). They consist of four (4) bedrock milling features and one (1) sparse lithic scatter.

A brief description of the sites follows.

SDM1: This small site is comprised of a single milling station on a large boulder just north of the entrance road to the camp. The feature, which consists of two bedrock mortars, is situated approximately 5 meters north of a small east-trending drainage. One of the mortars is quite well developed through use, but the other is less so. The site lies within an intact riparian community consisting of Live Oaks, reeds, and Western Sycamores.

SDM2: Located near the southern end of the property near the eastern fence line, this small bedrock milling site is the only one of numerous outcrops in the vicinity to have evidence of use. The feature consists of a single poorly developed slick measuring 43 cm x 33 cm situated on a low granitic boulder about 2 meters in length. The entire area surrounding the site has been severely disturbed by heavy equipment. This disturbance appears to have been associated with brush clearing, but may also indicate earlier efforts at minor cultivation of the area to promote pasturage. No artifacts were observed in the vicinity of the site. Given the level of disturbance any substantial deposits would probably have been evident.

SDM3: Approximately 100 meters south SDM 2 and three meters west of the eastern fence line along the access road, this small lithic scatter is comprised of 11 metavolcanic flakes and a single piece of quartz shatter. All of the flakes are interior, and at least three different cores appear to be represented. One large linear flake appears to have been removed from a bifacial core with a soft billet. The remainder seem to reflect unidirectional flake production and tool edge modification.

The condition of this site is relatively poor due to grading and tillage associated with road maintenance and brush control. Lying at the foot of the slope, it can be said with some certainty that the current ground cover of grasses and annuals does not reflect the native vegetation at this site. It is likely that these disturbances are periodic and ongoing. Today the artifact density appears to be very low, but the local level of disturbance has probably insured that some objects were carried below the surface. This site probably represents an outlying tool manufacturing scatter associated which may be linked to an as yet undiscovered habitation site elsewhere in the valley. In any case, it has little potential as a significant archaeological resource.

SDM4: Despite the fact that a large number of bedrock outcrops are scattered within the valley floor, very few appear to have been used as bedrock milling sites. One exception was found at site SDM 4, located on the west side of a large bedrock outcrop near the center of the camp. The site consists of two amorphous slicks located approximately 25 apart on separate portions of the exposure. One metavolcanic flake was found on the ground surface between the features. Both slicks are in fair condition, but are shallow and are not well developed. Ground visibility in the vicinity is very good, but no additional artifacts were observed in the area despite the proximity of water sources and numerous oaks.

Our observations of the bedrock in the valley suggest that the consistency of the rock is such that it is not very resistant to erosion. Because of this fact the rock may not have been particularly well suited for use in milling and if it was used the evidence was lost rather quickly to erosion. This may explain the relative paucity of features in a valley where we might otherwise expect a large number of processing sites.

This site exhibits no evidence of sub-surface materials. It is most likely that these slicks are simply the remnants of an occasional processing site and are not directly associated with the remnants of other activities.

SDM5: Numerous bedrock exposures were inspected along the drainages emptying into the valley bottom. Surprisingly, close inspection of these outcrops produced very little in the way of milling features. One obvious exception was found at site SDM5, which is a large exposure of fine-grained granite on the south side of a steep-sided drainage. Four milling slicks and a mano fragment were found at the feature, which measures approximately 50 x 9 meters. It is likely that there were other milling features at the site at one time, but these have been exfoliated in the intervening years.

The sediments surrounding SDM5 consist of course sands and gravels derived from the granitic basolith. There does not appear to be any evidence of accumulated cultural debris in the vicinity, and it is unlikely that subsurface materials exist given the topography and setting of this feature.

Summary and Recommendations

This survey revealed a series of four small milling sites and a lithic reduction station scattered about the eastern half of the project area. Our initial assessment of these resources is that they probably do not represent significant sites. However, under the guidelines set forth by the County of San Diego a statement of significance for archaeological sites requires a minimum amount of subsurface testing. This program should address the possibility of associated subsurface deposits and additional surface artifacts at each location. The precise scope of the testing will be determined in consultation with the County Archaeology staff.

If you have any questions regarding this report, please feel free to contact me.

Sincerely,

Jim Eighmey
Associate Archaeologist

Attachments:
References

Figure 1. Project Vicinity
Figure 2. USGS Quadrangle showing project and site locations
Attachment A - Confidential Records Search

References Cited

Bean, Lowell John, and Harry W. Lawton
1973 Some Explanations for the Rise of Cultural Complexity in Native California with Comments on Proto-Agriculture and Agriculture. In *Patterns of Indian Burning in California: Ecology and Ethnohistory*, by Henry T. Lewis, pp. v-xlvii. Ballena Press Anthropological Papers No. 1.

Carrico, Richard L., ed.
1983 A Brief Glimpse of the Kumeyaay Past: An Interview with Tom Lucas, Kwaaymii, of Laguna Ranch. *The Journal of San Diego History* 29:115-139.

Cheever, Dale
1992 *Results of the Pregrade Mechanical Excavation and Mitigation Monitoring at SDI-691, Aviara Development, Carlsbad, California.* Prepared by RECON for Hillman Properties West, Carlsbad.

Cline, Lora L.
1984 *Just Before Sunset*. J and L Enterprises, Jacumba, California.

Cupples, Sue Ann
1975 *An Archaeological Survey of the San Diego River Valley*. Unpublished report on file at SCIC, San Diego State University, San Diego.

Davis, Edward H.
1919 *The Diegueño Ceremony of the Death Images*. Contributions from the Museum of the American Indian 5(2).

Drucker, Philip
1937 *Culture Element Distributions: V., Southern California*. University of California Anthropological Records 1(1).
1941 *Culture Element Distributions: XVII., Yuman-Piman*. University of California Anthropological Records 6(3).

Eighmey, Jim and Dennis Gallegos
1993 *Historical/Archaeological Survey of the City of San Diego Future Urbanizing Sub-Area IV*. Gallegos and Associates, San Diego, California.

Gifford, E. W.
1918 *Clans and Moieties in Southern California*. University of California Publications in American Archaeology and Ethnology 14:155-219.
1931 *The Kamia of Imperial Valley*. Bureau of American Ethnology Bulletin No. 97.

Lewis, Henry T.
1973 *Patterns of Indian Burning in California: Ecology and Ethnohistory*. Ballena Press Anthropological Papers No. 1.

Luomala, Katharine
1963 Flexibility in Sib Affiliation among the Diegueño. *Ethnology* 2(3):282-301.
1978 Tipai and Ipai. In *Handbook of North American Indians*, Vol. 8, California, edited by R. F. Heizer, pp. 592-609. Smithsonian Institution, Washington.

Meigs, Peveril, III
1939 The Kiliwa Indians of Lower California. *Ibero-Americana* 15.

Moratto, Michael J.
1984 *California Archaeology*. Academic Press, Orlando.

Rogers, Malcolm J.
1945 An Outline of Yuman Prehistory. *Southwestern Journal of Anthropology* 1:167-198.

Shipek, Florence
1981 A Native American Adaptation to Drought: The Kumeyaay as Seen in the San Diego Mission Records. *Ethnohistory* 28:295-312.
1989 An Example of Intensive Plant Husbandry: The Kumeyaay of Southern California. In *Foraging and Farming: the Evolution of Plant Exploitation*, edited by D. R. Harris and G. C. Hillman, pp. 159-170. Onwin Hyman, London.
1991 *Delfina Cuero: Her Autobiography, an Account of Her Last Years and Her Ethnobotanic Contributions*. Ballena Press Anthropological Press Papers No. 37.

Spier, Leslie
1923 *Southern Diegueño Customs*. University of California Publications in American Archaeology and Ethnology 20:292-358.

Treganza, Adan E.
1942 An Archaeological Reconnaissance of Northeastern Baja California and Southeastern California. *American Antiquity* 2:152-163.

Wallace, William J.
1955 A Suggested Chronology for Southern California Coastal Archaeology. *Southwestern Journal of Anthropology* 11:214-230.

A • S • M
affiliates

Figure 1
Project Vicinity

Attachment A

Record Search

Confidential

Figure 2
Project and Site Location Map

Confidential
Not for Public Review